

TO ADDRESS THE SICK & INFIRM
CORBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 51.—No. 3.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1824. [Price 1s.

TO

MR. BROUGHAM.

*On the late Proceedings, relative
to Mrs. Henry Baring and
Captain Webster.*

Kensington, 14th July, 1824.

SIR,

It has not been often that I have meddled with matters of this sort; but, there are certain circumstances, connected with the affair of this unfortunate lady, which I cannot pass over in silence. Those which I shall first notice are presented to me in your speech before the Under-Sheriff and his Jury, which speech, together with the speech for the defendant, I shall insert below.

I complain, Sir, that you, in your speech on this occasion, pronounced an eulogium on that accursed system by which the great mass of the people of this kingdom have been brought into misery. You called the "BARINGs the "very highest of the most useful "class of the British commu-

"nity." You said, that ALEXANDER BARING was "well known, not "only to the mercantile characters "of this country, but to the states- "men who governed it;" which, if it had any thing rational in it, meant that he was a *statesman*. You said, that the "station and character" of these BARINGs "constituted ONE OF THE "MAIN PILLARS THAT "UPHELD this great and "prosperous COUNTRY."

What! is 1810 come back again? In that year, when one of the Jew GOLDSMIDTS cut his throat, or shot himself, in the same week that Sir FRANCIS BARING died, the newspapers swore, that the two "main pillars of public credit" had fallen! But, first of all, upon what *ground* do you state, that this is a "prosperous country"? This is a question to be answered; because it is of importance that we be informed what you look upon as marks of *prosperity*: whether prosperity is, according to your notions, evinced by the nakedness

and almost starvation of a full third part of the whole of the people; or by the enormous increase of the size of the *Wen*; or by the notorious fact, that the English and Scotch are constantly complaining, that the Irish labourers are coming into this island at a rate that threatens to *overwhelm* them. I should like to know from you, whether you look upon *these* as marks of prosperity; and, if you do not, where you will find those marks, either in the domestic state or in the foreign influence of the country.

But, waiting for your answer to this question, do you really look upon these **BARINGS**; do you look upon their "*station* and *character*" as constituting one of the *main pillars that uphold the country*? If you do, you must be *pretty fit* for a statesman or a legislator; and the country, this *great country*, must be reduced to a *pretty state* at last! What, am I to believe, then, that I owe my peace and safety, that I sleep a nights without having my throat cut; and, in short, that the breath of us all is in the nostrils of these **BARINGS**! Faith, those that like it (and you, Sir, amongst the rest) may believe this for yourselves; but, for my part, I look upon all persons of this description as in the very lowest and most despicable place in society. I do not mean the *men*: I mean their *trade*: their calling as *loan-makers*: a calling which I look upon with a mixture of contempt and abhorrence.

You would place before the Jury, you said, "*some of the highest members of the family*!" One would hope, that you did not put forth any thing so ridiculous

as this. "*Highest members of the family*!" What family? The children of a man who was a merchant's clerk at the close of the American rebel-war (in 1783); and who owed his rise to his having became *a handy city-man* to the father of the present Marquis of Lansdown. "*Highest members of the family*!" These were **Mrs. WALL** and **Mrs. KEMPT**, two sisters of the Barings. Very good women, likely enough; but, when you talk of "*highest members*," you fill one with disgust at the nauseous *adulation paid to mere masses of money*.

Was this adulation thought necessary to the case of your client? I remember hearing you say, during the trial of the poor **QUEEN**, that an advocate was bound to sacrifice *every thing*, even *his reputation*, to the cause of his client. I thought, at the time, that this was going rather *too far*; and, I thought, besides, that, if it were right, *the time* for saying it was *badly chosen*. But, what had the loan-making virtues of the Barings to do with the offence of **CAPTAIN WEBSTER**? What had their "*station*" and "*character*" as "*a pillar of the country*," to do with **CAPTAIN WEBSTER**'s alleged misconduct? The Captain had done nothing to hurt the Barings as *pillars*. To make out, that his misconduct had weakened these *pillars* of our *prosperity* and of our country, you should have gone on to show, that **Mrs. BARING** was a part of the pillar, and that, thus, the Captain, having undermined her, had done an injury to the whole of this main pillar, and had exposed the nation to being *let fall!* Good God! What an effect from *such a cause*! To

see a "great and mighty *empire*" come tumbling down into a heap of rains and of rubbish, only because a pretty lady took a fancy to a handsome young Captain! Why, Sir, what a state we are in, if this be the case! God knows, that, if our existence depend upon fancies of this sort, our lives are not worth many hours' purchase. If your doctrine be sound, *loan-dealers wives* ought to be pretty sharply looked after. You took occasion to observe, that the husband of the lady was in the "Senate." He ought to have induced the "Senate" to pass some *law* to prevent such dangers to the "main pillars of the country." You are, I believe, in the "Senate," too. Try your hand at such a law, Sir. The "Senate" has been called "omnipotent." Surely an omnipotent body can adopt measures to prevent dangers of *this kind* in future! I should like to see them try their hand at it. I should like to see their wit pitted against the wit of young wives with old husbands!

You had a right, Sir, to do what you could for your client, and you might think, that to talk about the *pillar* was calculated to do something for him. But, it is not for me to let pass this extravagant eulogium on loan-jobbing, when I know that it has produced so much misery in the country, and that it must, at last, produce some dreadful convulsion.

I have now something to say with regard to the case itself. I have always thought it wrong, that *any damages at all* should be given in such cases. There is no *sense* in the thing. It is, and must be, the most *capricious* of all earthly proceedings. But, the

great thing of all is, that every such case presumes that *there is no fault on the part of the husband*, and that the husband is *an injured man*: when the fact is, that, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, the husband has been the chief cause of the offence. Even in this very case you thought it necessary to observe, that Mr. BARING was separated from his wife by his "*duties in the Senate*." I am wholly at a loss to imagine what those duties were, never having heard of his having once opened his mouth in the said "Senate." If he were as reserved with his wife as he was with his brother "senators," it really is not much surprising, that she sought for other company. I thought it was a bad sign for you *voluntarily* to say, that the husband was *obliged to spend his evenings away from his wife*. No matter for the cause. If you made this observation, it was clear, that there was something expected to come out on the other side.

I do not so much care about the *thousand pounds* laid upon Captain Webster; for, if he have it, he may as well, perhaps, spend it in that way as in any other, and it will be only a drop in the sea to what the loan family already have. But, I do care about the *lady*, who has, I think, been *very hardly treated*. It is now twenty-six years, or thereabouts, since I saw her in her native town of Philadelphia, a place famous for the soft and beautiful features of its women, and she was then deemed the most beautiful of the beautiful. Her features were the sweetest that my eyes ever beheld; and she was, all taken together, the most perfect beauty that I ever

had seen, or that I have ever seen since. You know, Sir, that the laws of the petticoat (more powerful than those of the "omnipotent" House) require that we, upon such occasions, except *our own wives*; and this I hereby do in obedience to that law.

During the cross-examinations, the witnesses were asked, whether Mrs. BARING had ever been *married* before she was married to Mr. BARING. No positive answer was given to this; and an *insinuation* seemed to lurk under the question. The truth ought to be told, because it must tend to form an excuse for the lady, who is unfortunate enough without any addition from groundless insinuations. The truth is, then, that she was married at Philadelphia when she was not more, I should think, than *fifteen* or *sixteen* years of age. The history of the marriage is this.

Mr. BINGHAM, the lady's father, who was one of the richest men in the country, lived in Philadelphia, where he kept a house more like a English lord than like a republican citizen. He entertained all the noblemen and gentlemen, from England and from France, and, indeed, from Europe, who visited Philadelphia. The Dukes de Noailles and Liancourt, the present Duke d'Orleans and his brother; and, in short, all the nobles and gentlemen who visited that city. Mrs. BINGHAM was a very beautiful and accomplished woman: so that the house of Mr. BINGHAM, who was a *Senator* of the United States, was really by far the first house in the country.

Amongst the foreigners, who, at the time here alluded to, visited at Mr. BINGHAM's, was a COUNT

DE TILLY, a French emigrant nobleman. He was about twenty-two years of age, I should think, and the younger Miss Bingham, now Mrs. HENRY BARING, was, I should suppose, about sixteen. The COUNT was not what a man would think very handsome; but, women do not see men with men's eyes; and, besides, he talked well, was very gay, had a good deal of wit, was (I'll be bound for him) very *ardent* (a prime quality), and the bare sight of him would make you swear, that he never thought of a *loan* in his life; except, indeed, as *borrower*.

Nothing but what was very natural took place between these parties. The COUNT was *poor*; consent of parties was out of the question. The lady escaped from her father's house. They were privately, but *lawfully*, married in the *evening*; and that they did not *sit up* to wait for their pursuers you will readily suppose. Those pursuers got at them, however, before morning; and a party, in great force, under the orders and in the presence of an uncle of the lady, took her and carried her by actual compulsion to her father's house,

I, at that time, published a daily paper in Philadelphia. The COUNT came to me to make his complaint, bringing me a written statement of all the facts *for me to publish*; and I did publish it. Before the publication was out, however, the above-mentioned uncle, whose name was RICHARD WILLING, came to me to beg of me not to publish the COUNT's statement. I knew Mr. WILLING a great deal better than I knew the COUNT; but, the former did not deny any part of the COUNT's

statement, and, therefore, I published.

There now took place one of those things that have made me dislike republican government. The COUNT endeavoured in vain to get at his wife. Some creditor of the COUNT soon put him into prison. He got his release, upon condition, as I was told, of quitting the country; and (hear it, Jerry Bentham!) that famously honest and pure body, the two Houses of Assembly and the Governor of Pennsylvania, setting all law at defiance, PASSED AN ACT TO ANNUL THE MARRIAGE! Could this have been done in England, France, Spain, Austria; or, in any state in the whole world, *except Pennsylvania*? Never was there a more impudent piece of tyranny practised upon the face of the earth! And do we not now behold the fatal consequences? Mr. and Mrs. BINGHAM are dead; but, it is likely that Mr. RICHARD WILLING is alive; and, if he be, what must be his sorrow, especially when he reflects how happy his niece might have been with the husband of her first choice! I remember, that, when I remonstrated with him, he exclaimed: "Why, Cobbett, the fellow's a beggar." "Well," said I, "but her father has money enough." Alas! what has resulted from bringing her to England and marrying her to a rich husband!

Now, will any one believe, that the facts above related were *unknown* to Mr. Henry Baring? Would his brother ALEXANDER, who had married the elder sister, and who was at Philadelphia at the time of the younger sister's marriage with the COUNT; would

he hide this history from his brother Henry, when he saw him about to contract an alliance with his sister-in-law? Nay, would Mr. BINGHAM himself (who was in England at the time) hide the matter from Mr. Henry Baring, when the latter asked him for the hand of his daughter? Impossible. The husband must have known the history of the marriage with the COUNT DE TILLY. And, mind, that being the case, the most unequivocal proof ought to have been produced, that the lady *cordially consented* to the second marriage; for, unless such proof could be produced, what ground could there be for any damages at all? And, which is, in my opinion, of still greater importance, how much ground is there for excuse for this unfortunate lady?

The witnesses proved, or, at least, they stated, that the parties had lived together in *great harmony* and *affection* for about *twenty years*. Now, twenty years is a *long while*. If I had had this beautiful creature's *affection*, together with all the consequences of that affection, for *twenty years*, no consideration should have induced me thus to drag her out and fling her into the kennel. I should (or, at least, I hope so) have reflected, that she originally had been torn from the man she loved; that she became *mine* in consequence of a daring act of tyranny committed by the honest republican Legislature of Pennsylvania; that I knew this when I married her; and that I ought not to expect that unalterable attachment which might be my due under different circumstances.

The fate of this lady ought to be a warning to parents how they

listen to the insinuations of *ambition* and *love of money*. If Mrs. BINGHAM were alive now, what would her feelings be! Mr. BINGHAM tore his daughter from the arms of a *poor* husband to put her into those of a *rich* one. Happily for him, he is not alive to witness the consequences! He took care (or, I hope so, at least) to secure a good fortune to her. But, alas! the Count and she and a numerous family of children might have enjoyed this same fortune without loss of reputation. They would have made no *loans*, they would not have gambled by the *million*, they would not have been called "*main pillars*" of their country; but, they would not have been engaged in providing the means of carrying on desolating wars and of producing a state of things such as we now behold in Ireland. To call these Barings "*pillars of the country*" is to offer an insult to common sense; and it never ought to be without calling forth, from the press, expressions of resentment. Loan-jobbers, money-changers, and the whole of that tribe, may be, to certain extent, necessary evils; or, at least, it may be impossible wholly to sweep them from the face of the earth: but, when they, not only quitting the crawling posture that belongs to them, but assuming the contrary, have the audacity, by themselves or their agents and advocates, to call themselves "*pillars of the country*"; when they do this, it is time for us to do what we can, at any rate, to keep them from being our merciless masters.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient and

Most humble Servant,

Wm. COBBETT.

HENRY BARING, Esq. M. P.
versus
CAPTAIN WEBSTER.

At one o'clock on Saturday, an inquisition was taken before Mr. Birchall, the Secondary, at the Office of the Sheriff of Middlesex, in Red Lion-square, and a Special Jury, to assess damages in the cause in which Henry Baring, Esq. M. P. was plaintiff, and Captain Webster defendant, for the seduction of the wife of the former. The defendant suffered judgment by default. The damages were laid at 10,000*l.* The Court was crowded by persons of rank, who were friends of the parties in the cause.—Mr. Tindall read the declaration.

Mr. BROUGHAM stated the plaintiff's case. He said that the Jury must be familiar with the name of the plaintiff in this unfortunate inquisition—his name was that of a family which stood highly respectable and respected amongst all classes of the subjects of this empire, *but highest of all in the mercantile world*. It was universally known that the Barings were *the very highest of that most useful and respectable class of the British community*, whose intelligence and honesty and upright dealings throughout the world, had affixed upon them a station and character, which constituted one of the *main pillars that upheld this great and prosperous country*. Mr. Henry Baring, whose name they had heard as the plaintiff in this cause, was the third brother of that family. He enjoyed, by the accident of inheritance, a large fortune, but being disposed very early in life to follow the example of his family, and to earn an additional provision by his intelligence and industry, he repaired from his native home to a very distant settlement—he went, in fact, to the East India Company's factory in China, where he resided for several years, and employed to advantage the energies which he possessed for commercial business. After several

years residence in China, he returned home, still not more than 25 or 26 years of age. He found upon his return to his family, that his elder brother, Mr. Alexander Baring, a gentleman not only well known to all the mercantile characters of his country, but also to the *statesmen* who governed it, had just returned from America, where he had sojourned for some years, and brought with him *a lady of one of the first families in Pennsylvania*, whom he had shortly before married. This lady (Mrs. Alexander Baring) was accompanied to this country by a younger sister, who was the unfortunate subject of the present inquiry. Mr. Henry Baring, of course, became acquainted with the sister through his brother's wife. He soon felt the powerful fascination of her charms; he tendered his affections, and she made a reciprocal return of hers. Sir Francis Baring was not, however, at the moment, favourable to the match; he wished his son to reside abroad a little longer, in the pursuit of commercial affairs. The lady's father was equally indisposed to promote the marriage at the time; but the Jury, as men of experience in the world, must know that these parental obstacles, so far from operating to damp the affection of the young lovers, had a contrary effect, and rather riveted more firmly their mutual attachment. The ultimate consequence was, that Mr. Henry Baring married the lady in the year 1802. He would bring before them personages of rank, who would prove how affectionate and endearing was the married condition of these parties for years after the solemnization of the ceremony. Their mutual attachment was even, uninterrupted, and singularly warm in its continuance; that endearing affection which some married people measure by months, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring upheld for 20 years, until the defendant violated the sanctuary of friendship and love. Mr. Baring, as they all knew, was a Member of

Parliament; his duties in the Senate necessarily abridged a portion of the domestic society which he owed his wife; he was necessarily often absent from her some hours in the evening, and at the beginning of the Sessions of Parliament she sometimes took a trip for a week or ten days, never more, either to Brighton or to Paris, or to the watering-places, without being accompanied by her husband, whose avocations, on these occasions of rare occurrence, did not permit of his attending her. They never were separated from each other for any greater length of time until this unfortunate occurrence, which destroyed the domestic comfort of the plaintiff. The catastrophe was here carried to its bitterest extent upon the happiness of Mr. Henry Baring's family. The offspring of this marriage were five in number; the eldest was a daughter, recently married; another daughter thirteen years of age, a son nearly twenty, another son fifteen, and the last child an infant, not yet two years of age. To this very last birth he would prove the tenderest affection. It would be his most painful duty to call before the Jury several members of the Baring family, who would prove the affectionate intercourse which, up to the last moment of this seduction, subsisted between Mr. Henry Baring and his wife; painful indeed must it be for these witnesses to remember what had for twenty years, been the fidelity and affection of this lady, and to contrast it with her present *unhappy* *full*, as the victim of a wretched seduction. During the last year, or so, Captain Webster became an acquaintance of Mr. Henry Baring, and a visiter in his family. He was the son of the late, and brother of the present Sir Godfrey Webster, and held a military situation on the home staff of the Marquess Wellesley, the present Viceroy of Ireland. Captain Webster used to visit Mr. Henry Baring in town, and also in the sporting season at his hospitable

mansion in Hampshire. Indeed he was the only stranger, except his Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, who met the family at the christening of Mr. Baring's last child. Capt. Webster was certainly five or six years younger than Mrs. Baring; her attractions were, however, great and apparent, notwithstanding her advance in life, and they had been evidently weaned from her husband by Captain Webster. The captain, as a man of honour, should have shunned the charms of the wife of his friend; he should have remembered that these charms formed no excuse for his unlawful attachment, and could not be pleaded as any palliation of his crime. He should have remembered what he owed to the sanctuary of a husband's house, that husband being his host and friend; but he had violated those sacred obligations, and for that violation the Jury were now called upon to assess a pecuniary penalty. He ought to have remembered that this lady was the wife of his friend, and the mother of that friend's children. If her age could be pleaded by the defendant in any attempt at palliation, it should be recollected how that very age augmented the sufferings which the plaintiff must now endure. He had lost, not the society of a wife recently acquired, but of a lady whose intercourse with him had been hallowed by the endearing recollection, now turned into gall and bitterness, of more than 20 years of ardent attachment. See the dreadful feelings with which this family were now visited—the children at a time of life when they were entering into society, and capable of feeling keenly the act of their mother. There was besides an infant child, now bereft of a mother's care at the age which so peculiarly called for its fostering influence; and another child, a daughter, thirteen years of age, who must also be deprived of all those advantages of introduction into life which a mother could alone adequately con-

fer. If he were to be told by his Learned Friend that Captain Webster was not in the same flourishing pecuniary circumstances which Mr. Baring enjoyed, and could not, therefore, pay heavy damages on this occasion, he would say in reply, that before the Jury could look at that side, they must first consider what had been the plaintiff's loss, and what was the accumulated nature of his injury. The law of the land was, that if a man bound himself by his contract to perform a certain obligation, he could not escape from his pledge, by pleading the excuse of his poverty. He must have known his means before he framed the contract, and must be bound by his own act. So here, they could not allow the defendant to say he was unable to pay heavy damages. That would be to allow him to address them in such language as this: "I did the mischief—I inflicted the wrong upon my friend—but I am incapable of redressing it—I cannot afford you compensation in money, and therefore it is in vain to ask it at my hands." The Jury could not listen to such language. They must bear in mind, that it was the established usage in society to award ample compensation in such cases, and that if they failed in estimating that award upon such a scale, an inference would arise that the conduct of the plaintiff had not been what it ought, which in this case would be in direct variance with the positive evidence which he would place before them, from some of the *highest members of the family*. To vindicate, then, the plaintiff from such an inference as he had just glanced at—to prevent its going out to the world what he was not, he entreated them to weigh well the extent of damages with which they would visit the admitted guilt of the defendant. They would hear much better than he could describe it, from the witnesses, what were the terms of affection in which Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring had lived. Better, far better, even than the most elo-

quent speech, was the plain and simple evidence of the witnesses of truth describing the domestic facts which fell under their constant observation. They would from this evidence estimate what must have been the acts of the seducer; they would remember the home which he had made desolate, the children he had deprived of a mother, and the friend from whom he had torn a wife. They would shew by their verdict the sense they entertained of such conduct, and the protection which they were prepared to shed around the sanctuary of domestic life. The defendant was a military man, and they were members of a civil community, and they must tell military men, by their verdict this day, that at the conclusion of a war they must not bring into the domestic society of peaceable men the manners and habits which they may have acquired in countries where, unfortunately, less rigid morals prevailed, and where they might have indulged, in the course of service, in arts which are not to be endured in the domestic circle of unsuspecting private life. He concluded by entreating the Jury to award such a compensation in damages, which though no pecuniary redress could assuage the feelings, or mitigate the sense of loss to which the plaintiff was doomed, would nevertheless shew the defendant that he could not escape with impunity, and set an example which might deter others from pursuing the same arts and accomplishing the same ruin.

The first witness was *Mrs. Wall*, an elderly lady of elegant appearance. She stated that she was the eldest sister of *Mr. Baring*; recollects his marriage to his lady; her Christian names were *Maria Matilda*, whose sister had previously married *Mr. Alexander Baring*; they were American ladies. *Mr. Henry Baring's* first house in London was in *York Place*, and occasionally at *Farndown*, in *Surrey*, and afterwards at *Sommerville*, in *Hampshire*, which was still his residence; she had constant

opportunities of witnessing the conjugal tenderness of the family, and always observed the greatest tenderness on both sides between *Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring*, in whose house she had passed weeks together, and never saw between them the slightest altercation. There may have been differences of mere opinion, for they must occur everywhere. The eldest daughter of *Mr. H. Baring* was lately married, the eldest son is at *Oxford*, the second son in the navy, the younger children are at home.

Cross-examined by the COMMON SERJEANT: She visited at *Sommerville* last September, but not for a visit of any duration within the last three years. They always appeared to her to live affectionately together. She did not recollect (as well as she remembered) that *Mrs. Henry Baring* had been married before she saw *Mr. Baring*; *she heard something from others*. Last August the eldest daughter was married.

Mrs. Kempt, another sister of *Mr. Baring*, gave precisely similar testimony of the affectionate intercourse which she always saw subsisting between *Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring*. She did not know the defendant.

Cross-examined by Mr. PARK: Her general residence was a day's journey from *Mr. Henry Baring's* house. Last autumn twelvemonth she spent three weeks at his house in the country, and saw them repeatedly in London after. She never heard from *Mr. Baring* of any former marriage of his wife's.

This lady's husband merely confirmed the evidence of his wife.

Mrs. Dent, another sister-in-law, had only to repeat that she had uniformly witnessed the same affectionate conduct on the part of *Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring* towards each other. She was at the christening of the last child in 1822. She saw *Captain Webster*, who was the brother of *Sir Godfrey Webster*, on that occasion. The *Duke of Gloucester* was there.

Mr. John Mansfield, son of the late

Chief Justice, married an American lady, and soon after his return to England, in the year 1810, became an acquaintance of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Baring, who always appeared to him (and he spoke of his knowledge four years ago) very affectionately engaged to each other. He had been mostly abroad within a year or two, and had not seen so much of them; but he always thought they were a most indulgent couple to each other.

Cross-examined by the COMMON SERJEANT: He always visited Mr. Henry Baring in town and country, but not so much within the last three years, having been mostly abroad. He could not tell how Mr. Baring spent his evenings—he knew nothing of any former marriage of Mrs. Baring; she was under 17 years of age when she came to England.

Mr. Blagden, attended Mrs. Baring on the 12th August, 1822, at her accouchement. It was in London, and Mr. Henry Baring evinced at the time the most tender solicitude.

Some of the ladies who were already examined, were re-called, merely to prove that Mrs. Henry Baring was at Brighton with a French female attendant last November.

Four letters were then put in evidence, from Captain Webster to Mrs. Baring. The one was dated Dublin Castle, the others Brighton; all breathed the warmest love, and indicated an intimacy between the parties of the closest nature.

This was the case on behalf of the defendant.

Mr. DENMAN then said, it became his duty to address the Jury on behalf of his client, Captain Webster, who had suffered judgment to go by default, and thereby prevented disclosures which must have been painful to all parties, and disgraceful to some. But he could not help remarking, that it never was supposed that so little information would have been produced to the Jury, as a foundation for those heavy damages which his Learned Friend had anti-

cipated. He owned, that it did appear to him that there never was a case which presented so very few features to warrant such a calculation. It was true that some respectable ladies had been called, and who had given some evidence, but so very immaterial, as to lead one to suppose that they had been produced for no other reason than to give ornament and dignity to the cause; for it was quite impossible that they, from their rank and station, and connexion with the parties, could have been in possession of the secrets of Mrs. Baring, or qualified to speak as to her conduct and principles. They are the sisters of the husband—unquestionably, the sister of the wife could not have been brought forward; but were there not many others that might? There was a grown-up daughter, had she no governess? Why was not the French waiting-maid called, who had consented to act on some occasions as the “go-between?” She might perhaps, have told the Jury something of the interrupted happiness, as it was called, of the husband, but which, the Jury must have seen, had arrived at its conclusion long before Captain Webster had become acquainted with this lady. The lady's charms, which had won her husband's affections twenty years before, had vanished, and misery and distress and alienation had been planted in their place. How fallacious was all the evidence—how little upon which the Jury could rely. The respectable ladies who had been called, all stated that even in autumn last the appearances of Mrs. Baring to her husband were the same as usual; all was tranquillity and happiness and love, and yet she permitted a gross assignation with the defendant a month before. What then has any man to infer that his client was the seducer? The lady was married in 1802; she was then at least 18 years of age; she is now on the verge of 40, if, indeed, she has not passed that matured period of life. The gentleman was considerably under 30,

the younger brother of Sir Godfrey Webster, a Captain in the army; and was his guilt so great, or did the circumstances of the case warrant that he should be subjected to heavy damages, which would place his personal liberty for life at the mercy of a man whom he was supposed to have injured? He was anxious to find out what were the feelings of the husband, and with that view he asked Mr. Mansfield, not whether they observed the common intercourse of life, not the accidental circumstances of domestic life; but what, in fact, was the conduct of the plaintiff towards his wife—how he spent his evenings; whether his strong affection had lasted up to the period of the seduction (for then, indeed, the loss would have been irreparable); whether his attachment had not been *abated by former seducers*; or whether, in fact, when he had been released from the embraces of his wife, he had *lost any thing more than the name*? No opportunity had been afforded of any examination as to the situation of the lady before marriage, or any of those circumstances to point out the extent of the loss which the plaintiff had sustained. No such evidence had been tendered; and from its having been withheld, he was sure the Jury would draw the proper inferences. The last persons in the world likely to hear what was going forward, were the sisters of the injured husband; and yet they were the only persons called to describe the domestic happiness of the parties, which is now said to have been destroyed by Capt. Webster. It was painful to that Gentleman to be driven to this line of defence; it was distressing to him to come here at all; but it became the duty of his advocate to suggest those topics in reply to a case which had been left so singularly bare of circumstances of elucidation. No proof whatever had been adduced as to the period when the alienation of affections had taken place; the only time even suggested, was when Mr. Baring had be-

come Member for Colchester; and then it was stated by his Learned Friend that his Parliamentary duties had occasioned him to be absent from home sometimes for a week, sometimes for a fortnight; but what evidence was there to show when it was that Mr. Webster had become acquainted with the lady? None whatever. Even the French maid was not called to prove it: all was left to surmise and conjecture. The letters unquestionably “denote a foregone conclusion,” that the parties must have frequently met; but under all the probabilities of the case, he would ask, who was the seducer? His Learned Friend had made use of an expression not unfrequently introduced into cases of this description, namely, that the lady had been “more sinned against than sinning;” but if he could borrow the quotation, he would venture to apply it, and with much more reason, to his client, Captain Webster. All evidence had been most judiciously kept back, except those who were merely able to speak to the superficial appearances of the drawing-room; not one word as to the “secrets of the levee,” or the “mysteries of the boudoir,” or what was going forward on those evenings when the husband had absented himself from home. Was this, then, a case from which a Jury could say, that considerable damages should arise? His Learned Friend (Mr. B.) had spoken of Captain Webster, as if he had imported from foreign countries some secret spell to debauch the morals of the country; it would seem as if he had wished to denounce this gentleman, not merely as the first seducer of Mrs. B. but as the first transgressor of this sort in England; and he called upon the Jury with an energy, as if they were assembled to avenge the first inroad upon the national morals. It was quite true that Captain W. had passed much of his life abroad: he went early in youth to the death of the war in Spain; he was afterwards engaged in the French war, and nobly earned

those laurels which he now wore; but was it not a little hard, that when a soldier was sent into foreign climes in the service of his country, that circumstance should be cast against him as a matter of reproach? But let the Jury ask themselves this question—Was it probable that a young man, introduced into a family of the very highest respectability, would have dared to make advances to the head of that respectable family, if he had not received some encouragement, to which he was not now allowed to allude, but which the Jury could have no difficulty to guess? The difference of age was nothing—the difference of the circumstances of the parties was every thing. His Learned Friend had said that Capt. Webster should have previously considered his ability to pay damages, and, in fact, seemed to look at the case entirely as if it were a commercial contract. Had he been content with stating it was this young man's duty to have resisted any advances that could have affected the honour of the wife of his friend, and the mother of his friend's children, that would indeed have been the strong ground to have rested the charge upon. These were considerations which the criminal ambition of any man could not have overcome.—Who ever dares to commit such an outrage on society? Such attempts are out of the reach of youth and passion itself, unless the wife and the mother forgets the husband and the children, and makes overtures, to which the impudence of ambition would never have aspired. It was true she was the mother of five children, but were not those subjects for reflection? Ought she not to have remembered that she had a grown-up daughter, who has since been married; and who is now, perhaps, herself the mother of children—that she had a son of an age himself to be made the subject of a charge of this nature? These are things which must all have been forgotten by the wife before any man

would dare to enter the sanctuary of domestic happiness. No matter on what terms he might be in the family, or how high a place he might hold in the catalogue of visitors, he would never have aspired to such an intimacy, unless the lady's embraces had been prepared for his happiness. He would tell the Jury fairly, and he told it with pain, Captain Webster was not in a situation to pay heavy damages; and if it was merely the object of Mr. Baring to render his character clear and spotless, *nothing should be left to surmise or conjecture.* It has been stated, that the injury was greater, because it was the breaking up of an old friendship: he was ready to admit, that if his client had seduced the lady from the arms of a long-confiding husband, the case would have been much worse, as regards the husband, not better as regards the wife; but the circumstances of the case clearly demonstrated that the whole loss the husband has sustained was the being deprived of the appearances of love by which he had been deceived. His learned Friend had said, it was the duty of the Jury to give a lesson to others; that they kept a school for the purpose of teaching parties how to conduct themselves. But let it be remembered, that it was not merely the school for wives and lovers, but for husbands also; and when they come before a Jury, they should be prepared to give a full statement of their own conduct, and not rest their case upon the eloquence of their counsel, however powerful it may be. Let the Jury consider the situation in which the defendant was placed. Something was due to his character as well as to others: let him not be branded as a profligate seducer. He would remind them of a scene in the most popular of all our comedies, which was not inapplicable to the present case: it was in 'The School for Scandal,' where a conversation takes place between the two brothers, whilst Lady Teazle is placed behind the screen. The deliberate

and hypocritical profligate asks his brother how he should act in a case of such difficulty ? to which Charles Surface replies, " Why, brother, I hope I shall never be such a villain as deliberately to attempt the honour of a virtuous woman ; but, to be candid with you, I confess, if a pretty woman were to throw herself in my way—why, then, I fear I should be obliged to borrow a little of your morality." Under all the circumstances, he could not help thinking that the Jury would be of opinion, that the conduct of the defendant did not deserve that he should be consigned to the pains and miseries of a protracted imprisonment ; but that very moderate damages would amply satisfy the justice of the case.—The UNDER SHERIFF then told the Jury, that the frequency of cases of this kind rendered it unnecessary for him to make any observations on the nature of the question. They had heard the evidence, and it would be for them to say, under all the circumstances, what amount of damages justice required. The Jury deliberated for about half an hour, and returned a verdict for the plaintiff—Damages One Thousand Pounds.

POOR LAWS WANTED IN IRELAND.

THE reader will bear in mind, that I have frequently said, that the way to keep the people in Ireland from starving, was, to cause *rates* to be raised on the lands of Ireland, as they are on those of England, *for the relief of the poor*. This is a *great subject*, a really *great subject* ; but it cannot be fully discussed by me in the present Register.

You are aware, reader, that I have constantly opposed the doctrine of the unfeeling MALTHUS and the *Scotch feelosofers*, who would refuse relief to those who

are *able to work and cannot get work*. You must remember, that, in 1822, when the subscription was going on for the *starving Irish*, I, in all sorts of ways, showed, that *what was subscribed here only went into the pockets of the Irish landlords and parsons*, who thus threw on England the *charge of relieving their poor*.

I am now going to show, that the political *mob* is coming round to my opinion. We shall see the *poor laws planted in Ireland*, if it be not put off till it be *too late*. And it is my business to remind my readers, that this is *my scheme*. A pretty thing it will be to behold, after all the praises bestowed on MALTHUS and his audacious cruelty ! I have fought, single-handed, this parson and his monstrous school. Parson BRERETON, of Norfolk, is one of his most zealous disciples. But, this parson and the whole of the crew are now going to be blown up by *poor-laws in Ireland*. The beastly press in England, which has so long abused me, is now crying out for these laws. The Irish are *tired of starving*, and are *coming to England after the food*, which the landlords and parsons and taxgatherers have caused to be brought away from Ireland. This is right enough. It is so just and so natural that one wonders how any man of sense can be surprised, or any man of humanity be displeased at it. Nevertheless, the cotton lords, the humane Lancashires, seem to be made very uneasy by it. They confess that the people of Ireland are starving, but they say, that if they come here, they will produce famine and discontent in England. I take the following plaintive article

from a Manchester newspaper. The very sound of the word *Manchester* gives one the idea of a set of hard-hearted and ferocious people. Yet, their hearts melt in contemplating the mischief likely to arise from the emigration of the Irish. They would meet these poor creatures with a pitchfork, and toss them back into the sea; but, there would be danger in that; and, therefore, they *humanely* propose, that the Irish landlords and parsons shall be compelled to leave a little of the produce to feed those who raise all the produce, and keep them from starving; or, rather, keep them from coming to England; for, as to their starving, these humane fellows would not care a straw about that.

I will now insert this article from the Manchester newspaper; and after that I shall offer some further remarks: "In addition to the danger to be feared from a starving and discontented people, we suffer the evil of that extensive emigration of men, who, compelled to seek employment here, and accustomed to live at the bottom of the scale of comfort, occasion a most injurious competition with our own labourers, which reduces them to the same wretched level. The present system, which exempts the Irish Proprietor of the soil from the burden of supporting the poor, renders him indifferent to the circumstances which occasion poverty. He has little desire to avert an evil which affects not his interest, and few impulses to alleviate a misery which he is not present to witness. Humanity may do something, but the history of our

own island teaches us that there is danger in trusting to the irregular impulse of charity. Self-interest must concur to arouse that lively attention to the condition of the working classes which anticipates and provides against the evil that would ultimately affect the whole community. Hence in England and Scotland, in seasons of distress, the promotion of works of public utility, to prevent pauperism; self-interest and humanity in reciprocal action, giving energy to every exertion: while in Ireland the possessors of its surplus produce allow the people to starve in the midst of abundance —to gather the grain into the garner and die. In adopting the English system of assessments for relief of the poor, the Irish need not necessarily adopt its abuses. Divested of them, the burden is trifling. The last quarter's expenditure on the poor of Manchester, did not exceed four per centum on the quarter's rental."

This, observe, is from a vile Manchester newspaper, issued under the control of the cotton-lords. We have heard nothing, for several years past, but attacks upon the poor-laws. It has been quite a fashion, a raging fashion, ever since Malthus published his at once atrociously cruel and exquisitely stupid book. His proposition, was, to put an end to poverty by *putting an end to parish relief*. He laid it down as a principle, that, to give parish relief was *unjust as well as foolish*; that it was the giving of parish relief that had made the people poor; that the paupers must continue to increase if you gave them

parish relief; and that, therefore, he would put an end to that relief. Let us once more have his proposition before us in his own impudent, insolent, and diabolical words. Here they are; and mind what a muddy-headed parson it must be that could not write this little passage without three or four monstrous grammatical blunders.

“ To this end I should propose a regulation to be made, declaring, that *no child* born from any marriage taking place from the expiration of a year from the date of the law; and no illegitimate child born two years from the same date, should ever be entitled to parish assistance. After the public notice which I have proposed, had been given, *to the punishment of nature* HE should be left; *the punishment of severe want*; all parish assistance should be denied, rigidly denied HIM. HE should be taught that *the laws of nature had doomed him and his family TO STARVE*; that HE had no claim on society for the smallest portion of food; that if HE and his family were saved from suffering the utmost extremities of hunger, he would owe it to the pity of some kind benefactor, to whom HE ought to be bound by the strongest ties of gratitude.”

Here is the proposition of this parson. I have, upon many occasions, proved, the injustice and cruelty of this proposition. At present, I need not repeat such proof; for, we have now all the whole pack, every hound in the kennel of the press, crying out for *more poor laws!* All the old friends of the parson; all those who bellowed aloud for something to check population, are now

bellowing aloud for poor laws in Ireland.

At the time, in 1822, when subscriptions were going on for the starving people in Ireland, application was made to me, as well as to others. “ No,” said I, “ Gentlemen, I will not give you a farthing for the starving Irish. I pay poor rates to prevent the labourers of England from starving. Let the landowners and occupiers, and parsons in Ireland do the same; and then there will be no starving people in Ireland.” Just about the same time I addressed a letter to Lawyer Scarlett, which contained the following passage: “ But, we shall see no famine in England. We shall see tenants fall and landlords fall; but we shall see no famine. The difference between England and Ireland is this: There the landlord comes, or parson and landlord comes together, and *they sweep away all*. Here they would sweep away all; but *here is the Overseer, who comes before them*; who comes monthly or weekly throughout the year, or as often as he pleases, and *takes away from the land a certain portion of food sufficient to prevent the poor from starving*. In Ireland, where is no Overseer; where there is nobody to arrest, in its progress to the landlord and parson, this portion of human sustenance, *the poor creatures starve*. And this is the true history of the famine in Ireland, where we now behold the best possible proof of the wisdom as well as of the justice of the poor laws. If the poor laws were abolished in Eng-

" land, the farmer would pay to
" the landlord and the parson
" that which he now pays to the
" poor, and famine in the midst of
" abundance must be the conse-
" quence here as well as in Ire-
" land, unless prevented by a
" rising of the poor and a forcible
" seizure of the food."

At the close of this Letter to my friend Lawyer Scarlett, who was so completely a disciple of Malthus, that he had actually brought a Bill into Parliament to prevent the poor from receiving relief, if they married after a certain time. In short, his Bill was for carrying into effect the proposition of Malthus. At the conclusion of my letter to him, therefore, I said, "Now, Lawyer Scarlett, I will tell you how to make yourself a "a great man; or, at least, a "man of something; and that is, "to propose the adoption of the "English poor laws in Ireland!"

This seemed, at the time, to be a merely bantering with the lawyer; but seriously, and upon my soul, I should not at all wonder, if the lawyer were to follow my advice. A thing full as surprising I am now going to exhibit in an extract from the Morning Chronicle. This paper has, for many years, been leagued with another paper called the "Scotsman," and the Edinburgh Review, in endeavouring to cry down and to cause the total abolition of the poor laws. I care not for its equivocations: I disregard its little shuffling: I am sure the public will agree with me, that this Morning Chronicle newspaper; that the "Scotsman" newspaper; that the Edinburgh Review; that Scarlett and Ricardo, and even Mr. Brougham,

have all been endeavouring to cause the total suppression of the poor laws. Day after day, and week after week, has the Morning Chronicle contained articles driving after this point. All these politicians have contended, at the same time, that we had a redundant population. Supposing this last to be true, to demolish the poor laws is necessary; for, if the population be redundant, there is no remedy but shooting, or stabbing, or drowning, or starving a part of it. However, the *redundant population* seems at last to be discovered to have been a monster of a disordered brain; and, strange to relate, the Morning Chronicle, the great disciple of Malthus, is now coming forward (and he comes not forward in vain, observe,) as an advocate for the enacting of poor laws for Ireland! Bravo! This is a triumph, indeed. But let us have his recantation in his own words, published in the Chronicle of Tuesday last. Pray, observe how difficult it is to get the pill down his throat. He has wrapped it up, you see, in all sorts of ways; but, here he is telling us that he is for having poor laws in Ireland. Never mind how he wraps the thing up: never mind the wry faces that he makes: down goes the pill, and here it is. "We "have long been satisfied that it "is impossible to put down va- "grancy in a country in which a "provision is not made by law for "the sick and impotent poor. We "are at the same time far from "supposing that the mere esta- "blishment of compulsory rates "for the poor would of itself go far "towards the cure of the diseases "of Ireland. What we mean to

"say is merely this, that *poor rates should not be left out in any plan for the improvement of that country*. The principle of a poor's rate, and the abuses which have taken place under the poor laws of the South of England, are perfectly distinct. We have always maintained that a provision to the sick and impotent poor is *indispensable to a civilized country*, and it will be found that some provision is made for the poor in every country in Europe which lays claim to civilization. In the Catholic countries of the South, there are indeed no poor's rates, but the poor are supplied by the religious houses. In the rest of Europe, where slavery prevails, the lords maintain the old and infirm on their respective estates, and where the people are free, the different parishes and communes maintain their own poor. In Iceland, Sir GEORGE M'KENZIE informs us that the poor's rates are frequently thirty times higher than the Government tax. We know of no country except Ireland, in which the poor are wholly without the least provision for their maintenance, and certainly the state of that country affords no particular recommendation of any practice which is peculiar to it alone. However something at all events must be done for the poor labourers of this country, who suffer from the competition with people in the lowest state of wretchedness. In some parts of the island the Irishman's cabin is beginning to be more frequent than the cottage of the native."

So, here is this writer, who was

for abolishing the poor laws in England, not only wanting to see such laws in Ireland; but contending, that there is no civilized country in the world in which provision is not made for the indigent poor. I beg the readers of the Register: I mean those who have read it for many years, to look back to the Register, Number 33, of Volume 34, written in Long Island, on the 6th of February, 1819, and published in London on the 8th of May of that year. That Register contains a Letter to Parson Malthus, *on the rights of the poor*. In that letter I proved the right to parish relief for the indigent; I proved it to be consonant with the law of nature; to be consonant with the common and statute law of England. I showed, that, the Catholic Church made provision for the poor out of the tithes and other parts of its income. I showed that, previous to the existence of Christianity in England, the duty of maintaining the indigent, fell upon the lords of the soil.

Now reader, look at the above article from the Chronicle. See what it says, about the provision made by the Catholic Church. See what it says about the provision made in those parts of Europe where vassalage exists. Will you believe, that the writer of this article never read the Letter to Malthus? No: you will not believe that. In short, the whole of the above article seems to have been written with that letter lying open before the writer. The Editor of the Chronicle has published two articles in the way of commentary upon my two Letters to Sir Francis Burdett. I have put them by, and

it is my intention to notice them in detail, when I notice that famous *Report*, which a Committee of the big House made, some time ago, upon the state of Ireland. There is, however, one point, which I must notice here, and to which I must take the liberty to beg the reader's attention. I said, in one of my Letters to Sir Francis Burdett, that to talk of redundant population was nonsense, as long as immense quantities of provisions continued to be sent from the country. I contended, that no Government had a right so to manage matters as to take away from the country the food absolutely necessary to keep the people from starving. In short, I contended that the existence of so large a surplus of food was a proof that there was, in fact, no surplus of mouths.

The Editor of the Chronicle, with true northern sarcastic sneer, observed, that, *I seemed to forget that there was such a thing as property*; that the landlords of Ireland had been used to receive certain somethings which they called rents; and that they might not be extremely well pleased at my plan for making the labourers share in a division of the produce of the land. Before men contradict others, they ought to think a little of what they are about; but before they give a sarcastic, and, what they deem a triumphant, contradiction, they ought to think a long while. Here we have this same Editor of the Chronicle himself forgetting, then, that there is such a thing as property; for, here is he proposing the enacting of *poor laws for Ireland*; that is to say, proposing assessments, or *deductions*, from the rents of the landlords, to be

given to the labourers who have no money and no work! What mode is there more complete than this of giving PAT, as the Editor of the Chronicle sneeringly calls him, a part of the rents of the Irish landlord? English noblemen own half that island, by themselves and by their relations in the Church. There are the Duke of Devonshire, the Marquis of Hertford, the Marquis of Lansdown, Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord Middleton; in short, the island is theirs more than any body's else, as the thing now stands. The Duke of Devonshire observed, in the House of Lords, in the most unconcerned manner, that he was the owner of the tithes in *twenty parishes* of Ireland! Now, the Chronicle found fault with me because I said that part of the produce of the land ought to remain in Ireland to feed the people; that the landlords and parsons ought not to be suffered to draw it away in such quantities as to leave the people to starve; that they ought to be compelled to leave a part of it to feed those by whose labour it had been raised. The Chronicle found fault with me for this; but, he is now himself proposing that this very thing shall be done. The English landowners in Ireland will be compelled, if there be poor laws established, to leave a sufficiency of the rents to feed the people. This they will be compelled to do, or it is my real opinion they will lose the country altogether.

This is the doctrine for which I have always contended: that every man who was willing to labour, or who was unable to get labour, had a **RIGHT** to be maintained out of the land of the country. A very unpalatable doctrine to a

hectoring aristocracy, and a doctrine by no means unpleasant to an aristocracy such as ours once was, and as it may, I hope, be again. But, palatable or not, it must be swallowed. While the Irish remained at home, and laid down and died quietly, for fear of a certain thing that I shall not describe : while this was the case, none of our humane gentry talked about giving them poor laws ; but, now that they come hither ; now that they follow the bacon and butter and flour up to London ; now that they come and take the half-swallowed orts out of the mouths of the half-beggar half-labourer Englishmen ; now, the English landlords and cotton-lords and lords of the anvil begin to be frightened. The hungry Irish come and drive out the Scotch and the English ; underbid them in the labours of the field ; make them fall with more voracity upon the poor rates ; and by this means they reach the pocket of the English landlord and parson. Thus it is that these are made to cry out for Irish poor laws ; or, in other words, for a law to compel the Irish landlords and parsons to give up part of their rents and part of their tithes to feed the Irish labourers and keep them at home.

There is a blessed state of things ! What more do we want to prove the excellence of Mr. Frederick Robinson's House of Commons ? The Irish must be fed at home, or to England they will come ; it is very right that they should come ; for they have a right to a sufficiency of food. Hitherto they have not been so hard pressed as they are now. A large portion of the rents and of

the tithes go to be swallowed up by the jews and jobbers, and by the dead-weight people, and all their innumerable tribes of wives and children—all gentlemen and ladies for the industrious people of this country to keep for ever. A large portion of the rents and tithes now go away to be swallowed up by these parties. The landlord and parson, however, still want to have rents and tithes. They press upon the cultivators, and a part of these must be reduced to starvation ; unless there be somewhere a compulsory power to make the landlord and parson give up a part.

The Morning Chronicle now sees the necessity of such compulsory power. It will not, nevertheless, be obtained without difficulty. The insolent, the ruffian-like Squirearchy, will give up not one single potatoe, if it can avoid it. The infernal Orange faction will see death and destruction to itself in any thing like an equitable system of poor laws. The barbarous and brutal chiefs of that faction will see that it can no longer trample people under its feet. Therefore, there will be great difficulty in obtaining poor laws for Ireland ; yet, without that measure, I believe that Squirearchy and Orangemen may very soon bid adieu to their power of exercising the basest tyranny that ever was known in the world.

Once more let me congratulate my readers upon our having the Morning Chronicle with us. He is worth three or four score of the *teeves* that cross the channel occasionally. If we can keep him firmly with us, he will bring over others, and then the *teeves* will carry on their barter in vain.

It is very good to see the turn which things have taken. The bacon shops, the immense magazines of that sort of food in London, are filled with bacon from Ireland. It is the same with the butter stores. It is pretty much the same with the flour stores. Hampshire is a county famous for its bacon. Where there is one pound of Hampshire bacon eaten in Hampshire, there are perhaps, five pounds of Irish bacon eaten in that county. What sort of a man must that be then, who seems angry at seeing the Irish labourers come here. Give them an Overseer in each parish of Ireland. Let him have power to make assessments and distribute relief: let the Irish labourer find the means of avoiding starvation at home; let the Irish Overseer keep back the tithes of seven or eight out of the twenty of the Duke of Devonshire's parishes, and I will warrant you that we shall hear no more about Ribbon-men and White-boys, and shall see Sir Francis Burdett no more under the painful necessity of expressing his willingness to invest the old India Governor with the powers of martial law.

I suppose that the miseries of Ireland; that to keep the Irish from bursting out into open rebellion, costs, at this moment, not less than six or seven millions of pounds sterling a-year. Collect a third part of this money in poor rates, and make a just distribution of those rates, and you may reduce the Irish army to a number sufficient to be a guard of honour (for it is a thing indispensable) to the most noble the Lord Lieutenant. The whole of the poor rates of England do not amount to so much money, a

it now costs to keep the Irish down by force. Where, then, can be the reason for not adopting a system of poor laws. It is so manifestly wise, and so manifestly necessary, that there can be no reason for not adopting it, except that it is a measure of *my recommending*. However, my lads, take the measure you must; give up a part of your rents and tithes you must; or you must very soon give up the whole.

Let the public always bear in mind, that it is the accursed funding system; that it is the Bishop Burnet system; that it is the funding, the banking, the loan-jobbing, the stock-jobbing system, which has brought things to the present pass. The fundholders, as they call themselves, are continually gaping to the Government for heaps of money; the Government is compelled to send out its scouts to collect the money; these scouts squeeze the landlord and the parson; the landlord and the parson fly at the farmer; the farmer sticks his claws into the labourer's dinner; and there being no Overseer in Ireland to step in and rescue a part of the dinner from the farmer's grasp, he takes the whole of the dinner away, and the labourer starves. Then, observe, if it were not for the heavy taxes which the Debt demands, *there would be no army required*. When Sir Francis Burdett was at the review on Hounslow-heath, the other day, and had those fat and smooth horses in his eye, and those costly saddles and costly dresses of the men, did he think, I wonder, of his project for sending the people of Ireland out of their country? If the subject came into his mind, and if the beauty of the exhibition did not deprive

him of his powers of calculation, he would find, I fancy, as much money to be raised in taxes every year for supporting, probably, the five thousand men whom he saw before him, as would support a hundred thousand labouring men, women, and children. I speak very much within compass, I dare say. It would not be at all surprising to me, if the military people (exclusive of the Royal Family) whom he saw at that show, cost as much annually as would maintain all the labouring inhabitants of *a hundred parishes* in Ireland. And, while any portion of those labourers are in any danger of starving; while it can be possibly rational for him to propose to send the Irish people out of their country, let me ask him, if one single penny ought to be expended upon those military men, whose exhibition he went to honour with his presence?

Before I conclude, let me say a word or two about that *Catholic religion*, which the Chronicle has so often and so furiously attacked; let me say a word or two about its effects on the state of a country, and, particularly on the *state of the poor*. The Chronicle, in the above-quoted article, says, that, in "Catholic countries, "the poor are supplied by the "the *religious houses*." Indeed! Well, then, is it so *very clear* that the "Reformation," as it is called, was a *good thing*? Come, come, Mr. Chronicle, tell us, whether, from your own premises, it does not clearly follow, that the miseries of Ireland, and that all the dangers now to be expected to arise from those miseries; does it not, from your own premises, clearly follow, that the "Reformation" was not so *very good* a

thing? Daylight is not more evident than the fact, that, if there had been no "Reformation," as they call it, the Collective would not now be put to its wits' end to know what to do with Ireland. Nay, give the Catholic Church the tithes and glebes *now*, and there will be an end, at once, to the miseries of Ireland; and that, too, *without poor laws!* What! is this *nothing*, then? And is not this notorious? Is it not *sure*, that, if the tithes and glebes were in the hands of the Catholic Church, *it would provide for the poor out of those tithes and glebes*; and that there would be an end to starvation, to ribbon-men, and to sunset and sunrise laws?

And now, Mr. CHRONICLE, let me, in conclusion of my article, ask you, whether you think it would be for the good of the *people* of Spain and of *Spanish America* to transfer their "*religious houses*" (which *take care of the poor*, you know) to the infamous, Christ-killing, Jews, and to the rest of the band of Jobbers, who, had they been alive at the time, would have been beforehand even with the Jews? Do you think it would be for the *good of the people* of Spain and of *Spanish America* to be "*REFORMED*" à *la Irlandoise*? Now, pray give me a *direct* answer to this question. Say, YES, or NO. How can you say *yes*? And, yet, you must say *yes*; or, what becomes of all the volumes in folio, which you have written in favour of those revolutions, an essential part of which is, the breaking up of all "*religious houses*" (which "*take care of the poor*," you know) accompanied with the putting of an end to all the means of relieving the poor? A pretty good *puzzle*

for you! The greedy wretches, who were ruined by Spanish Bonds, placed their reliance on the proceeds of the sale of the Conventual and other Church estates. Consequently, the poor of Spain would have been exposed to starvation, as the poor of Ireland now are. For, mind, the *Benthamite* revolutionists never talked about making *poor laws*! They were applauded by many worthy Protestants for *robbing the Catholic Church*; but, the robbery was, in fact, *committed more on the poor* than on the Church; and, if the French had not marched into Spain and *delivered it*, the people of Spain would soon have been what those of unfortunate Ireland now are. I say, that they *delivered* Spain: they delivered it from a set of loan-jobbing tyrants; from a band of unfeeling wretches who would have sold to Jews all the means of relieving the poor; a band of at once ignorant and unprincipled wretches, who would have squandered or pocketed the proceeds of the Church property, and have reduced the labouring people to the state in which those of Ireland now are; that is to say, to a constant state of half-nakedness and half-starvation. The man that could wish to see the people of any country reduced to such a state must be a *monster*. The fact is, that you are far from wishing it; but, you do not *reflect*. Wm. COBBETT.

TO MESSRS.
BROUGHAM AND SCARLETT.

Posbrooke Cottage, Titchfield,
Hants, May 27, 1824.
GENTLEMEN,

HAVING recently seen, in your addresses respectively to the House of Commons, on the subject of the

appointments of Assessors to the Sheriffs of counties, under the Bill now before the House, called the County Courts Bill, that you state the independence of the British Bar to be in great danger of being injured by twenty-one appointments being to be made under the patronage of the Crown, and that therefore the danger which you speak of is impossible to be avoided; I am induced to write my sentiments on this occasion to you, and humbly to state to you, that I differ very much in opinion with you as to the independence of the Bar being at all endangered, (and which it is a great point for the public to preserve) by the giving these situations to barristers, who are, generally speaking, men of independent principles. But I would suppose for a moment, that half of these appointments should be filled by men who think politically with the Ministers, and the other half by men who think politically with the Opposition; would that circumstance interfere with either in the discharge of their public duty, in actions of small debt or trover? In what way is this possible, with honourable men, possessing honourable minds too, and being men of education, (which they must necessarily be, to be placed in so respectable a situation as that of a barrister-at-law), and being desirous of doing their duty with the strictest impartiality, wholly at such time throwing out of their minds who appointed them, or by what means they came into the situation of assessors? Again, I would ask you, whether any assessor would inquire who the suitors in their Courts are; what are their politics, and how they voted at elections, before a decision is given

for or against a plaintiff or defendant? And further, I would inquire, could any bias be created in their minds by any one, however high in rank or station, attempting to make interest with them for or against a plaintiff or defendant? And lastly, I would put this position to you: would any honourable man become a courtier or sycophant, or be guilty of political inconsistency or servility, when he is to exercise his private franchise at elections for members of Parliament or otherwise, because he has been placed in the situation of an assessor? I am free to answer to the first query: That it would not interfere with the full, impartial, and proper discharge of their duty; and to the second, I am as certain in my answer when I declare, that no such inquiry would be made, nor would any but a fair decision be given in any case which might come before an assessor, on that account; neither would any attempt be listened to, if offered, to induce a decision one way or the other. And to my last position, I do not hesitate to answer, that no assessor possessing the honourable mind, which I will give full credit for in every barrister, would alter his principles and vote against his conscience at any election, or do any other act against his own feelings, because he has been appointed an assessor, let that appointment come from what channel it will. You may say I am very confident of the honourable situation of a barrister-at-law; it is true I am, and that in all my answers I fix my true faith on the very high sense of honour I have ever found in a general knowledge of them for thirty years, and in the

barristers I have had the honour of meeting, on the Western Circuit particularly, and at other places also: uniformly I may say, such have I found them; and one general idea, as far as I can collect, has pervaded the minds of all, that, by their profession, they are placed in a most highly honourable situation in society; and honourable men could not do any or either of these degrading acts which I have taken the liberty to point out to you; and you say, in your speech on Monday night, that the men to be appointed will be most honourable and competent men. Indeed, Gentlemen, I have only to look at your own characters to prove my positions, as neither of you have ever changed your *most respectable career* of life, because you have had the honour of a silk gown from the Crown; your politics, your conduct, have been the same honourable, honest, independent politics and conduct which they ever were before that was the case. No bias seems to have been created in your minds, but the same straightforward course seems to have been pursued by you respectively as politicians and senators, yet doing at the same time your public professional duties to those who so deservedly put their confidence in you, by entrusting their different cases in your hands, let their or your political sentiments be what they may. I take the liberty also of stating, that any gentleman of the Bar, appointed to the honourable situation of an Assessor under the County Court Bill, would, equally with you, possess these honourable sentiments; and, be their politics what they may, would (unmindful of those

politics) discharge their duty to the public in such situations. Where, then, is the independence of the Bar endangered? And I would ask, whether, on reflection, you have not (certainly not intentionally, but really in fact) rather cast a strong censure on the Bar than maintained its independence, to establish which you had a strong inclination beyond all doubt. I pray you to excuse me in taking the liberty of thus addressing you; but as your speeches in the House of Commons have been made public throughout the kingdom by public prints, I thought it more proper to place my address to you in the same channel of public communication.

I have the honour to be,
Gentlemen,

Your obedient humble Servant,
R. W. MISSING,

Barrister at Law, and Member of the
Western Circuit; and Member of the
Hon. Society of the Inner Temple.

P. S. I have one observation more to make, as to Mr. Scarlett's assertion of what will be the result of these appointments; viz. "That the men appointed would, "no doubt, be gentlemen of honour and character; but once appointed, they would naturally "keep looking for something better by-and-by. It was natural "to expect, that men so appointed "would keep looking to their parents, and only consider their "first appointment as a footstool "by which they were to mount "higher. Men so appointed "would possess great power in "their different districts; they "would destroy, in a great degree, the independence of the "Bar, and might be looked upon "as the agents and ministers of

"government in the different "counties." Now, if these men to be appointed are to be "gentlemen of honour and character," as above stated, will they, as soon as appointed, lose both honour and character, by becoming servile to their patrons? I again say not, if they possessed honour and character before they were appointed; and for the best of reasons, that men of honour and character cannot be servile; and certainly, an example is immediately before our eyes, in the Welsh judges; who, by servility to their patrons, do not look higher, but are content to remain in those honourable situations for life; and, indeed, I know of no instance where a Welsh judge has been elevated to the higher courts, which I look upon as a self-evident fact to support my assertion.

TO THE
EDITOR OF THE REGISTER.

SIR,—For many years past we have heard a loud clamour on the subject of the relief of Insolvent Debtors, till, at length, our law-givers have been compelled to *turn round*, and pass a law for the *Protection of Creditors*. At least, the law just passed, if it do not *protect the property* of the creditor, will certainly give him a greater power over the miserable debtor. In the present state of things, creditors undoubtedly suffer great hardships, and often great injustice: a debtor stopping payment, for instance, and being notoriously insolvent, can, nevertheless, put his creditors off, and

delay payment for a year or two. Such things, unfortunately, are too common. But, Sir, with great deference to our lawgivers, the question, and the only question at present deserving our consideration, is, *can the tide of insolvency which now threatens to overwhelm all, be arrested in its progress?* My opinion is, and long has been, that it cannot; and experience has taught us, that no legislative enactments will deter men from giving or from taking credit. *Necessity*, indeed, is the motive in either case. Any man at all acquainted with the state of society in this monstrous town, knows perfectly well, that more than one half of its population would speedily require "*extremeunction*" if this system of credit were put an end to. Stop credit, Sir; I mean credit as it now exists, and in a few months, more than half the houses west of Holborn and Charing Cross, would be without inhabitants. In short, this *system* must go on *entire*, or it must cease altogether. People who get food and raiment upon credit, because they cannot pay ready money, will continue to do so in spite of all the laws that can be enacted; for they will find plenty, who, having obtained the means of supplying them, *in the same easy way*, will readily run the same risks which others have run with them. "*Light come, light go*," is an old saying, and a very true one.

Between the Bankrupt Act and the Insolvent Act, there is, in one particular, a gross inconsistency. Under the former, a creditor having a preference in contemplation of bankruptcy, is punished, and very appropriately punished, by being made to refund. Under the

latter, the creditor receiving a preference, even of the whole of the insolvent's estate, is allowed to retain it; and the *insolvent* is punished by imprisonment! A very neat way of compensating the other creditors for the loss of their property! I should be glad to know why this distinction is made? Do we not daily see men brought before the Commissioners, who manifestly had made up their minds to submit to imprisonment for the purpose of securing some friend to whom they had made over their property? Since these Commissioners are thought worthy of being invested with such extensive powers as are given to them by the Act, surely it would not be too much to authorize them to order, or the insolvent's assignees to bring, an action for the recovery of property, as in cases of bankruptcy. Perhaps this alone would prevent more fraudulent cases in the Insolvent Court, than all the other provisions of the Act put together. Insolvency, however, will continue to gnaw out the vitals of the community; and whilst every encouragement is given to the idle and the profligate to live upon the labour of others, instances will not be wanting of debtors committing "*flagrant injustice*" towards their creditors. As soon as I can get a perfect list, I mean to class those who have taken the benefit of the Insolvent Act, and show the number of farmers, dead-weight men, &c. respectively.

I am, Sir,
Your humble Servant,
M. L.
July 10, 1824.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 3d July.

Per Quarter.	s.	d.
Wheat	61	1
Rye	40	8
Barley	33	8
Oats	26	7
Beans	38	7
Peas	38	2

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 3d July.

Qrs.	£.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat..	7,650	for	24,256	3	9
				Average,	63
Barley....	276....	437	2	8.....	34
Oats....	15,344....	21,923	18	7.....	28
Rye....	42....	85	18	0.....	10
Beans	1,386....	2,681	2	9.....	38
Peas....	429....	862	17	3.....	49

Friday, July 9.—There is a considerable supply of all kinds of Grain this week, except Barley. The fine weather causes a great dulness in the sale of Corn, and Wheat hardly supports the terms of Monday. Barley fully supports last quotations. Beans still keep falling in value. Oats are now so plentiful that they have suffered a reduction since Monday of at least 1s. per qr.

Monday, July 12.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain last week were unusually large, except of Barley. This morning there is not a considerable addition to the quantities, but a sufficiency of most sorts of

Corn remains over from last week to make a full market. The continued fineness of the weather, and the late large supplies of Wheat and Flour, have rendered the Wheat market excessively dull, so that the finest parcels hardly maintain last quotations, and other qualities are 2s. to 3s. per qr. cheaper, and much left on hand unsold.

Barley continues scarce, and the trade limited, so that the prices remain as last quoted, with but little doing. Beans have experienced a further decline of 1s. per qr. Boiling and Grey peas are unaltered. The large quantities of Oats that have lately come in, have astonished our buyers, and they purchase so few that this trade is nearly in a state of stagnation, so that but little progress can be made in sales even at a reduction of 2s. per quarter from last Monday's prices. The trade for Flour is very heavy.

Prices on board Ship as under.

Wheat, red, (old)	60s. to 70s.
— white, (old)	68s. — 76s.
— red, (new)	40s. — 46s.
— fine	48s. — 54s.
— superfine	62s. — 63s.
— white, (new)	46s. — 50s.
— fine	52s. — 60s.
— superfine	65s. — 69s.
Flour, per sack	55s. — 60s.
— Seconds	50s. — 55s.
— North Country ..	46s. — 50s.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10d. by the full-priced Bakers.

ACCOUNT OF WHEAT, &c. ARRIVED IN THE PORT OF LONDON,
From July 5 to July 10, both inclusive.

Whence.	Wheat.	Barley.	Malt.	Oats.	Beans.	Flour.
Aberdeen	606
Aldbro'	338	20	15	19	18
Alemouth	1081
Arundel
Banff	892
Berwick	110	18
Boston	9132	5
Bridlington	1128
Clay	413
Cowes	20
Dundee	20
Colchester } Essex	501	91	210	10	454	1140
Harwich } Essex	1077	55	239	815
Leigh } Essex	1460	20	68	70
Maldon } Essex	1210	100	691	1500
Gainsbro'	340
Grimsby	320
Hastings
Hull	4747
Inverness	20	200
Ipswich	295	99	580	20	500
Kent	2138	30	125	334	269	1476
Louth	76	300
Lynn	325	34	494	780	18
Montrose
Newcastle
Plymouth	48
Rye
Spalding	1170
Southampton	35
Stockton	20
Southwold	261	29
Whitby	369
Wisbeach	13	120	3701
Woodbridge	716	15	15	293	95	531
Yarmouth	112	2874	1925
Cork	1100
Dungarvon	750
Waterford
Youghall	50	1720
Foreign	200	445	1555 b
Total	8201	838	4413	29567	1868	8846
						1555 b

Aggregate Quantity of other kinds of Pulse imported during the Week:

Rye, — ; Pease, 250 ; Tares, — ; Linseed, 80 ; Rapeseed, — ;

Brank, 10 ; Mustard, 17 ; Hemp, 123 ; and Seeds, 217 quarters.

SEEDS, &c.

Price on board Ship as under.

	s.	s.
Clover, red, Foreign per cwt	50	75
— white, ditto .. ditto ..	44	76
— red, English, ditto ..	52	76
— white, ditto .. ditto ..	52	74
Rye Grass	per qr...	25
Turnip, new, white .. per bush.	10	12
— red & green .. ditto ..	10	16
— yellow Swedes ditto ..	9	11
Mustard, white	ditto ..	7
— brown	ditto ..	8
Carraway	per cwt	40
Coriander	ditto ..	8
Saufoin	per qr..	30
Trefoil	per cwt	18
Ribgrass	ditto ..	23
Canary, common .. per qr..	38	46
— fine	ditto ..	48
Tares	per bush.	3
Hempseed	per qr..	32
Linseed for crushing		
Foreign	ditto ..	30
— fine English		
for sowing	ditto ..	44
Rapeseed, 23 <i>l.</i> to 25 <i>l.</i> per last.		50
Foreign Tares, 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> to 4 <i>s.</i>		
Linseed Oil Cake, 9 <i>l.</i> 9 <i>s.</i> per 1000.		
Foreign ditto, 5 <i>l.</i> per ton		
Rape Cake, 4 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> to 4 <i>l.</i> 15 <i>s.</i> per ton.		

Monday, July 12.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 4177 firkins of Butter, and 1669 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign ports 7592 casks of Butter.

City, 14th July, 1824.

BACON.

Notwithstanding the favourable-ness of the weather, Bacon is more likely to decline in price than to advance. The price, indeed, is too high; it is about *thirty five per cent higher than at this time last year*; whilst the price of Butcher's meat is nearly *the same* as it was at this time last year. Landed, 55*s.* to 56*s.*

BUTTER.

The Dutch comes in plentifully, and, being cheap, keeps back those who would otherwise be running into speculations in Irish.—Dutch, 74*s.* to 76*s.*

CHEESE.

This branch is unprofitable, and consequently unsatisfactory, to all parties. The Factors procure from the wholesale Cheesemongers, all the orders they can; and then send them some without orders; and when they have disposed of all they can in this way, they forward the remainder of their stocks to London; then come up and go round to all the trustworthy retailers (who ought to be the customers of the wholesale men), and sell to them as low, and, in some instances *lower*, than they had been selling to the wholesale dealers. Is it any wonder, then, that those retailers who have no credit or money to buy where they please, are continually breaking, to the great injury of the trade? Cheshire, 68*s.* to 84*s.*—Double Gloucester 66*s.* to 74*s.*—Single 50*s.* to 60*s.* For common Cheese there is hardly any demand at all.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, July 12.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	i. d.	s. d.
Beef	3	8 to 4
Mutton	3	8 — 4
Veal	4	0 — 5
Pork	4	0 — 5
Lamb	4	8 — 5

Beasts ... 2,033 | Sheep ... 25,470
Calves 266 | Pigs 170

NEWGATE (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	i. d.	s. d.
Beef	2	8 to 3
Mutton	3	4 — 4
Veal	3	0 — 5
Pork	3	0 — 5
Lamb	3	4 — 5

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	i. d.	s. d.
Beef	2	8 to 4
Mutton	3	8 — 4
Veal	3	4 — 4
Pork	3	4 — 5
Lamb	3	8 — 5

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS—per Cwt.

Ware..... 8s. 0 to 10s. 0

Middlings... 5 0 — 6 0

Chats 2 0 — 3 0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware 10l. 0 to 12l. 0

Middlings ... 5 0 — 6 0

Chats..... 3 10 — 4 10

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay .. 90s. to 130s.

Straw ... 42s. to 54s.

Clover 100s. to 140s.

St. James's.—Hay..... 80s. to 147s.

Straw... 42s. to 57s.

Clover .. 90s. to 128s.

Whitechapel. Hay .. 90s. to 135s.

Straw. 48s. to 58s.

Clover.. 110 to 140s.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	<i>Wheat.</i>	<i>Barley.</i>	<i>Oats.</i>	<i>Beans.</i>	<i>Pease.</i>
	<i>s. to s. d.</i>				
Aylesbury	53 65 0	36 38 0	25 30 0	37 42 0	0 0 0
Banbury	52 62 0	34 38 0	25 28 6	38 42 0	0 0 0
Basingstoke	51 67 0	32 37 0	25 28 0	40 46 0	0 0 0
Bridport.....	52 60 0	26 32 0	18 24 0	42 0 0	0 0 0
Chelmsford.....	52 69 0	34 38 0	24 32 0	28 38 0	36 40 0
Derby	62 68 0	34 40 0	27 31 0	42 48 0	0 0 0
Devizes.....	56 76 0	30 33 0	28 32 0	40 46 0	0 0 0
Dorchester.....	50 74 0	26 32 0	27 30 0	40 46 0	0 0 0
Exeter.....	64 78 0	36 40 0	20 25 6	48 0 0	0 0 0
Guildford.....	52 68 0	35 39 0	26 33 0	42 48 0	0 0 0
Henley	54 78 0	35 38 0	25 32 0	38 46 0	36 44 0
Horncastle.....	55 61 0	24 30 0	20 26 0	36 40 0	0 0 0
Hungerford.....	46 66 0	26 32 0	18 31 0	38 45 0	0 0 0
Lewes	56 64 0	0 0 0	27 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Lynn	48 60 0	28 33 0	21 26 0	38 39 0	0 0 0
Newbury	50 76 0	30 35 0	26 30 0	34 43 0	40 0 0
Newcastle	44 68 0	30 35 0	26 32 0	37 42 0	38 44 0
Northampton....	56 63 0	33 35 0	24 28 0	40 43 0	0 0 0
Nottingham	62 0 0	38 0 0	25 0 0	43 0 0	0 0 0
Reading	5 72 0	27 34 0	20 30 0	34 42 0	33 43 0
Stamford.....	40 61 0	35 36 0	22 23 0	38 40 0	0 0 0
Swansea	63 0 0	36 0 0	26 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Truro	59 0 0	40 0 0	32 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Uxbridge	50 75 0	35 37 0	28 33 0	42 44 0	40 0 0
Warminster.....	44 68 0	25 36 0	27 32 0	46 52 0	0 0 0
Winchester.....	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Yarmouth.....	56 62 0	32 34 0	24 27 0	36 38 0	36 38 0
Dalkeith*	25 34 0	24 30 0	20 26 6	21 25 0	21 25 0
Haddington*	25 34 0	24 30 6	21 26 6	20 24 0	20 24 0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, July 6.—Since Tuesday last the arrivals of Grain have been inconsiderable, and sales of Wheat and Flour were made to a limited extent only, during the week, at about late prices. The sales of Oats were somewhat more extensive throughout that period, at a decline of 1d. per 45 lbs.; but the trade on the whole was heavy and uninteresting. This day's market was very sparingly attended, and sales confined to needy buyers in small lots, so that, with the exception of Oats, prices are about nominally the same as those of this day se'n-night. The weather has continued rainy, but not so much so as to be otherwise than favourable for the crops generally.

WHEAT, per 70lbs.				OATS, per 45lbs.				FLOUR, per 280lbs.								
s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.					
English	9	0	10	6	English	3	10	—	4	1	English	50	0	—	51	0
Scotch	9	0	—	10	Scotch	3	10	—	4	1	Irish per					
Welsh	9	0	—	10	Welsh	3	10	—	4	1	280lbs.	46	0	—	49	0
Irish ..	7	9	—	8	Irish	3	3	—	3	10	OATMEAL, 240lbs.					
Foreign	0	0	—	0	BEANS, per qr.						English	33	0	—	36	0
BARLEY, per 60lbs.					English	43	0	—	47	0	Scotch	32	0	—	36	0
English	5	3	—	5	Scotch	42	0	—	44	0	Irish	28	0	—	32	0
Scotch	4	10	—	5	Irish	42	0	—	44	0	INDIAN CORN per					
Welsh	4	10	—	5	Dutch	42	0	—	44	0	quar.	36	0	—	40	0
Irish	4	10	—	5	PEASE, per qr.						RAPE SEED, per					
MALT.					Boiling	40	0	—	46	0	last £22.					
Per 9 gal.	8	0	—	8	Grey	32	0	—	36	0						

Imported into Liverpool from the 29th June to the 5th July 1824, inclusive:—Wheat, 2,280; Barley, 255; Oats, 3,697; Malt, 40; Beans, 2; and Peas, 25 quarters. Flour, 2,721 sacks, of 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 389 packs, of 240 lbs. American Flour, 4,490 barrels.

Norwich, July 10.—There never was less business transacted at this market than to-day; very few merchants were at their stands an hour after the usual time, and then but few samples appeared, scarcely any of which were sold.

Bristol, July 10.—The Corn Market at this place is extremely dull, and the prices continue without variation from last week's quotation.

Birmingham, July 8.—Dullness pervades both Corn and Flour trade, at about recent quotations. Weather still indifferent for the hay harvest.

Ipswich, July 10.—Our market to-day was not so plentifully supplied with Wheat as for several weeks past, and scarcely a sample of anything else. Superfine samples of Wheat were sought after by the Millers, and prices fully equal to last week's were given, while the middling and ordinary were totally neglected. Prices as follow:— Wheat, 50s. to 64s.; Beans, 35s. to 37s. per qr.

Wisbech, July 10.—The sale of Corn this day was very small indeed, and prices were lower.—Best Wheats, 58s. to 59s.; inferior sorts, 54s. to 56s. per quarter. Oats and Beans much as heretofore.

Boston, July 7.—We had but a sparing supply of samples of Grain at this day's market. We have had no alteration in price since last week. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 56s. to 62s.; Oats, 20s. to 25s.; and Beans, 36s. to 40s. per qr.

Wakefield, July 9.—The arrivals of Wheat and Beans for this day's market are considerable; there is also a fair proportion of other descriptions of Grain. The trade has generally ruled very dull. Fresh Wheat is the only sort which meets with the least attention, and such must be noted 1s. per quarter lower; chambered samples are offering at a further reduction, but without effect. Oats have declined 1d. per stone, and Shelling 1s. per load;—the idea of the ports opening on the 15th of August creates an alarm, and very little is doing in these arti-

cles. Beans 1s. per qr. below last week, and scarcely any demand. Malt very dull, but without any material alteration in price.—Wheat, new and old, 56s. to 70s.; Barley, 24s. to 36s.; Beans, new and old, 38s. to 49s. per quarter, 63 lbs. per bushel; Potatoe Oats, 28s. to 32s. per quarter; Mealing Oats, 14*1/2*d. to 15d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Shelling, 36s. per load of 261 lbs.; Malt, 42s. to 44s. per load of 6 bushels; Flour, 48s. to 50s. per sack of 280 lbs.; and Rapeseed, 23*1/2*l. to 26*1/2*l. per last.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended July 3, 1824.

	<i>Wheat.</i>		<i>Barley.</i>		<i>Oats.</i>	
	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
London	62	7	34	11	28	7
Essex	62	5	34	4	27	8
Kent	63	1	35	0	28	0
Sussex	59	7	0	0	26	8
Suffolk	58	8	32	0	28	2
Cambridgeshire	56	9	34	0	22	4
Norfolk	58	4	30	11	24	0
Lincolnshire	59	11	35	10	24	10
Yorkshire	63	3	0	0	24	0
Durham	68	2	38	0	33	10
Northumberland	61	0	38	2	30	0
Cumberland	63	9	43	6	33	6
Westmoreland	63	7	44	0	32	9
Lancashire	65	1	0	0	29	6
Cheshire	68	10	0	0	29	0
Gloucestershire	62	4	33	4	26	6
Somersetshire	63	8	35	7	24	6
Monmouthshire	65	0	0	0	0	0
Devonshire	67	2	34	0	23	10
Cornwall	63	1	37	10	26	4
Dorsetshire	61	5	28	0	26	4
Hampshire	58	2	31	6	26	0
North Wales	71	1	44	7	27	1
South Wales	59	10	39	0	22	5

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended July 3.

Wheat..36,015 qrs. | Barley.. 3,408 qrs. | Beans...3,391 qrs.
Rye..... 270 qrs. | Oats....18,368 qrs. | Peas.....706 qrs.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, July 10.—We had an abundance of Lambs at market to-day, but many of which were of an inferior description, by no means saleable; the fine Lambs went off readily at 21s. per head. Fat Beef and mutton was plentiful at prices similar to those last week.

Horncastle, July 10.—Beef, 6s. 6d. to 7s. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 5d. to 6d.; Lamb, 7d. to 8d.; and Veal, 6d. to 7d. per lb. to

At Morpeth market on Wednesday, there were a good many Cattle; fat sold readily at an advance in price; being a full market of Sheep and Lambs, prices were much the same.—Beef from 5s. 3d. to 5s. 9d.; Mutton 5s. 3d. to 5s. 10d.; and Lamb 6s. to 7s. per stone, sinking offals.

At the annual Fair at Stockbridge there was a good show of Lambs, which obtained an advance of 3s. and 4s. per head upon the prices of last year. Store Lambs sold at from 12s. to 22s. A few pens of very prime Lambs sold as high as 28s. per head. The demand was brisk, and nearly all the stock offered was readily purchased.

At St. John's Fair, Lewes, there was a considerable number of Tegs and Cull Lambs penned for sale, the former of which went off briskly at improved prices; but the latter exceeded expectation, having fetched from 8s. 6d. to 14s. per head, upon an average full 4s. per head higher than was obtained for the same description of Lambs, at the last year's Fair. There was a tolerably good shew of West-country Beasts, for which 3s. per stone were demanded, and few in consequence met with purchasers.

Price of HOPS, per Cwt. in the BOROUGH.

Monday, July 12.—Our accounts state, that the bines on the dry soils have grown considerably the last few days, but the weak, and those on stiff wet soils, do not at present improve.—The duty has varied the last three days from 105,000*l.* to 135,000*l.* Currency the same; but little doing.

Maidstone, July 8.—The fine weather this week has certainly made an improvement in our Hop plantations, which generally are getting on better than expected: the forward bines appear to do best, still the backward ones look more healthy and better than when we wrote last. We hear, that in the

Weald of Kent the prospect of the plantation is far from so promising as in this neighbourhood.

Worcester, July 7.—On Saturday 28 pockets of Hops were weighed in our market; the prices suffered no decline. Our accounts from the plantation are not so favourable; in consequence of the ungenial weather, the bine in many situations remains weak, and the plants look yellow; should chilly weather continue, the prospect of a crop will be much diminished. There are very few flies.

COAL MARKET, July 9.

Ships at Market.	Ships sold.	Price.
35½ Newcastle.	25½.	31s. 0d. to 38s. 6d.
17½ Sunderland	13½.	31s. 6d.—40s. 6d.